

Dimension-Five Operators in Grand Unified Theories

Joshua Sayre, Sören Wiesenfeldt, and Scott Willenbrock

Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,
1110 West Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

Abstract

Extensions of the standard model with low-energy supersymmetry generically allow baryon- and lepton-number violating operators of dimension four and five, yielding rapid proton decay. The dimension-four operators are usually forbidden by matter parity. We investigate to what extent the appearance of dimension-five operators at the Planck scale may be constrained by the different grand-unified gauge groups. Dimension-five operators are suppressed in models based on E_6 and $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$, where four matter fields do not form a gauge singlet. An intermediate scale offers the possibility to sufficiently suppress these dimension-five operators.

Although the standard model (SM) is extremely successful, it is likely that it is only an effective theory, subsumed by a more fundamental theory at short distances. If this more fundamental theory lies at a scale much greater than the weak scale, M_W , then weak-scale supersymmetry supplies a means to stabilize the hierarchy between these two scales. Remarkably, with the renormalization group equations of the minimal supersymmetric extension of the standard model (MSSM) above the weak scale, the three gauge couplings (with $\alpha_1 = \frac{5}{3}\alpha'$, such that hypercharge is a properly-normalized $SU(5)$ -generator) meet at $M_{\text{GUT}} = 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV. This supports the idea that the strong, weak, and electromagnetic interactions are unified into a grand unified theory (GUT) with a single gauge coupling. It is striking that the experimental evidence for small but non-vanishing neutrino masses fits nicely in this framework, as M_{GUT} is of the right order of magnitude to generate small Majorana masses for the neutrinos.

Weak-scale supersymmetric models generically allow baryon- and lepton-number violating operators of dimension four: QLd^c , $u^c d^c d^c$ and LLe^c . Here Q and L denote the quark and lepton doublet superfields and u^c , d^c and e^c the up and down antiquark and the positron superfields, respectively. Since these operators mediate very rapid proton decay, there must be an additional symmetry that forbids some or all of these operators. One possibility is matter parity, a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, where the matter superfields are odd, and the Higgs and gauge superfields are even [1]. Matter parity is a discrete subgroup of $U(1)_{B-L}$, and is equivalent to R parity [2].

Even with matter parity, however, the baryon- and lepton-number violating dimension-five operators $QQQL$ and $u^c d^c u^c e^c$ are allowed.¹ These operators are generated when color-triplet Higgs fields, which are generically present in GUTs, are integrated out. These Higgs fields must acquire masses of order M_{GUT} in order to avoid rapid proton decay via these dimension-five operators. With superpartners at the weak scale, the proton decay rate is

typically near the experimental limit [4].

Regardless of grand unification, we should expect these dimension-five operators to be gravitationally induced [5]. If they are suppressed by the Planck mass, $M_P = (8\pi G_N)^{-1/2} = 2 \times 10^{18}$ GeV, their coefficients must be smaller than 10^{-7} in order to satisfy the bounds on proton decay.² One way to explain these small coefficients is to argue that they are similar to Yukawa couplings [7]; this idea may be realized in models with spontaneously-broken global [8] or gauged [9] flavor symmetries. There is, however, considerable doubt that exact global symmetries exist in nature [10]. Even if they do, it is not guaranteed that they can adequately suppress gravitationally-induced proton decay in the context of a grand-unified theory. If the flavor symmetry is a gauge symmetry, it is very difficult to embed it in a grand-unified theory.

In this paper we investigate to what extent the appearance of these operators at the Planck scale may be constrained by the different grand-unified gauge groups. Among the most promising GUT groups are $SO(10)$ [11], E_6 [12] and $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \equiv G_{\text{TR}}$ [13]. As rank-5 and rank-6 groups, they have a $U(1)_{B-L}$ subgroup, and thus potentially preserve matter parity [2].

In $SO(10)$, the MSSM matter fields, together with the right-handed neutrino, fit into the spinor representation, 16_M , while the MSSM Higgs fields are in the vector representation, 10_H . Therefore $SO(10)$ distinguishes between matter and Higgs fields. The dimension-four operator $[16_M]^3$ cannot appear, as it is not $SO(10)$ invariant. This is an improvement over the MSSM as well as $SU(5)$, where the dimension-four operator $\bar{5}_M \bar{5}_M 10_M \ni QLd^c + u^c d^c d^c + LLe^c$ is allowed by the gauge symmetry.

Matter parity is automatic in $SO(10)$ if one restricts the Higgs representations to be of even congruency class, so that the only operators allowed by the gauge symmetry contain an even number of matter fields [14]. In particular, if $U(1)_{B-L}$ is broken by the vacuum expectation

¹These dimension-five operators can be forbidden by another discrete symmetry, baryon triality [3]; however, this symmetry is not consistent with grand unification.

²Conversely, the decay rate is sufficiently suppressed if the scalar matter fields (sfermions) are as heavy as a few hundred TeV [6]. However, in such scenarios fine-tuning is needed to leave one Higgs field at the weak scale.

value (vev) of the SM singlet in $\overline{126}_H$, then matter parity emerges as a discrete gauge symmetry. Right-handed neutrino masses are generated at the GUT scale via the renormalizable operator $16_M 16_M \overline{126}_H$; this is desirable to generate eV-scale masses for active neutrinos via the see-saw mechanism.

Alternatively, $U(1)_{B-L}$ can be broken by Higgs fields in the spinor representation. Then the distinction between matter and Higgs fields is lost, with the undesirable consequence that matter parity is no longer automatic. For example, consider the operator $[16_M]^3 16_H$, with a coefficient of order $1/M_P$. This operator includes the product of SU(5) fields $\bar{5}_M \bar{5}_M 10_M N_H$. When the SM singlet field N_H acquires its vev, $\langle N_H \rangle \sim M_{\text{GUT}}$, the dimension-four operators $\bar{5}_M \bar{5}_M 10_M \ni QLd^c + u^c d^c d^c + LL e^c$ are generated, suppressed only by M_{GUT}/M_P . Hence, we must impose matter parity (or some other symmetry) to forbid this operator.

Whether matter parity is automatic or imposed, the dimension-five operator $[16_M]^4 \ni QQQQL + u^c d^c u^c e^c$ is allowed by SO(10) symmetry. We should expect this operator to be induced at the Planck scale, in which case its coefficient must be less than 10^{-7} to evade the bounds on proton decay. Whether it is possible to arrange this with spontaneously-broken flavor symmetries is a model-dependent question. For example, consider the rather complete SO(10) model of Albright and Barr [15]. This is an interesting model where a global flavor symmetry does not provide sufficient suppression of gravitationally-induced dimension-five operators. The $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ flavor symmetry allows the operator $16_1 16_2 16_3 Y' A$, where subscripts denote the generation. After Y' and A acquire GUT-scale vevs, it generates the operator $Q_1 Q_2 Q_3 L_3$, which is suppressed by only $(M_{\text{GUT}}/M_P)^2 \sim 10^{-4}$.

Let us therefore proceed to E_6 , where the MSSM matter fields are embedded in the fundamental representation, 27_M . It decomposes with respect to $SO(10) \times U(1)$ as

$$27 \rightarrow 16_1 + 10_{-2} + 1_4. \quad (1)$$

In addition to the SO(10) spinor, which contains the MSSM matter fields, we find an SO(10) vector and a singlet, S . Since

$$27 \times 27 = \overline{27} + \overline{351} + \overline{351}', \quad (2)$$

fermion masses can be generated via renormalizable Yukawa couplings to Higgs fields 27_H , 351_H , and $351'_H$ [16], where

$$351 \rightarrow 10_{-2} + \overline{16}_{-5} + 16_1 + 45_4 + 120_{-2} + 144_1, \quad (3)$$

$$351' \rightarrow 1_{-8} + 10_{-2} + \overline{16}_{-5} + 54_4 + \overline{126}_{-2} + 144_1. \quad (4)$$

Contrary to SO(10), the product of three matter fields, $[27_M]^3$, is gauge invariant. Thus E_6 matter parity, under which $27_M \rightarrow -27_M$, is never automatic. Despite this, R parity³ may still be automatic, depending on which Higgs fields (and which vevs) are used to break E_6 [2].

As in SO(10), R parity is not conserved if the SM singlet field in the 16_1 component of 27_H , N_H , acquires a vev. In this case, we generically have the two operators

$$c [27_M]^3 \ni c 16_M 16_M 10_M \quad (5a)$$

$$y 27_M 27_M 27_H \ni y (16_M 16_M 10_H + 16_M 10_M 16_H + 10_M 10_M S_H), \quad (5b)$$

where y is the Yukawa coupling and we denote the SO(10) singlet Higgs field by S_H . The first term in Eq. (5b) generates quark and lepton masses when 10_H acquires a weak-scale vev. The last term generates a mass of order $y M_{\text{GUT}}$ for the matter fields in 10_M when S_H acquires its vev, breaking E_6 to SO(10). Integrating out the 10_M field from Eqs. (5), we generate the operator⁴

$$\frac{c y}{y M_{\text{GUT}}} [16_M]^3 16_H \quad (6)$$

which yields the usual dimension-four baryon- and lepton-number violating operators when N_H acquires its vev. Therefore, we must impose E_6 matter parity to ensure that R parity is respected. Note that this operator is obtained regardless of the specific mechanism that gives mass to 10_M . The only essential point of the above example is that $U(1)_{B-L}$ is broken by N_H .

On the other hand, R parity is automatic in E_6 if $U(1)_{B-L}$ is broken via the SM singlet Higgs field in the $\overline{126}_{-2}$ of $351'_H$ [2]. This is analogous to the case of SO(10), discussed above. Now right-handed neutrino masses are generated via the renormalizable operator $27_M 27_M 351'_H \ni 16_M 16_M \overline{126}_H$.

Whether or not E_6 matter parity is imposed, four matter fields, $[27_M]^4$, do not form an E_6 singlet. This is an improvement upon SO(10), where $[16_M]^4$ is allowed by the gauge symmetry. However, dimension-five operators can still be generated from higher-dimensional operators. For example, consider the dimension-six operator $[27_M]^4 \overline{27}_H$, which contains the $SO(10) \times U(1)$ invariant operator $[16_M]^4 \overline{S}_H$. We should expect this operator to be generated at the Planck scale with a coefficient of order $1/M_P^2$. When $\overline{S}_H$ acquires a vev, breaking E_6 to SO(10), it generates the usual SO(10) dimension-five operator, suppressed by only $M_{\text{GUT}}/M_P \sim 10^{-2}$.

In the discussion thus far we have seen that the vevs of S_H and $\overline{S}_H$ generate a mass for 10_M as desired [Eq. (5b)], but also generate the unwanted dimension-five operators. This is because both $[10_{-2}]^2$ and $[16_1]^4$ contain an SO(10) singlet with $U(1)$ -charges ± 4 . If we replace S_H with the

³To avoid confusion, we henceforth refer to matter parity as R parity, to distinguish it from E_6 matter parity.

⁴Since the Yukawa coupling y is a matrix in generation space, the coefficient of this operator should be read schematically.

45_4 of 351_H or 54_4 of $351'_H$, the same result is obtained. Thus we see that *any Higgs field that gives mass to 10_M also generates the dimension-five operators*. In order to sufficiently suppress these operators, the vev of this Higgs field must be much smaller than M_{GUT} . Hence, we must break E_6 at the GUT scale with Higgs fields that do not generate a mass for 10_M . We then generate a mass for 10_M at an intermediate scale, $M_I/M_P \leq 10^{-7}$, such that the dimension-five operators are generated with a sufficiently-small coefficient. Since 10_M consists of complete $SU(5)$ multiplets, their presence at an intermediate scale does not upset gauge-coupling unification.

Restricting ourselves to E_6 Higgs fields in the lowest-dimensional representations, namely 27_H , 78_H (adjoint), 351_H , and $351'_H$, we have found a model that can successfully implement the above scenario. Consider two Higgs fields in the $351'_H$ representation, $351'_{H1}$ and $351'_{H2}$, and one field in the adjoint representation, 78_H . The vev of the $SO(10)$ singlet of $351'_{H1}$ breaks E_6 to $SO(10)$, the $\overline{126}_{-2}$ component of $351'_{H2}$ breaks $U(1)_{B-L}$, and the adjoint field completes the breaking to the SM. The SM singlets, S_M and N_M , obtain masses via couplings $27_M 27_M 351'_{H1} \ni 1_4 1_4 1_{-8}$ and $27_M 27_M 351'_{H2} \ni 16_1 16_1 \overline{126}_{-2}$, respectively. It is noteworthy that this model automatically preserves R parity; this was not required *a priori*.

So far, E_6 is broken to the SM, and it is easy to check that we cannot generate the dangerous dimension-five operators: $[16_1]^4$ has $U(1)$ charge $+4$ and is a singlet under $U(1)_{B-L}$, whereas the singlet in $351'_{H1}$ has $U(1)$ charge -8 , and the vev of $351'_{H2}$ violates $U(1)_{B-L}$ by two units. On the other hand, we have not yet generated a mass for the 10_M . As discussed above, this can be accomplished by introducing another Higgs field in the 27_H , 351_H , or $351'_H$ representation, acquiring an intermediate-scale vev in the S_H , 45_4 , or 54_4 direction, respectively.⁵ This Higgs field also generates the unwanted dimension-five operators, but with a suppression of $M_I/M_P \leq 10^{-7}$.

In fact, this Higgs field might even break the electroweak symmetry, via a vev in the 10_{-2} direction. In this case, the mass hierarchy of the 10_M is related to that of the SM fermions [see Eq. (5b)]. For $M_I = 10^{10}$ GeV, we can expect the particles to be as heavy as 10^5 , 10^8 and 10^{10} GeV. As mentioned above, the inclusion of three copies of $SO(10)$ -fields 10 does not upset gauge-coupling unification and only slightly increases the value of M_{GUT} [17]. Moreover, it allows for perturbative unification: we effectively add 1.8 copies at the weak scale, which increases the gauge coupling at M_{GUT} by a factor of 1.6. The mixing of 10_M with down quarks and leptons is suppressed by M_W/M_I .

It is beyond the scope of this work to construct a superpotential that generates the desired vevs. It is a generic problem to explain the hierarchy between the weak and the GUT scale. Whether the presence of the intermediate

scale complicates this problem is an open question. Note, for instance, that $M_I^2/M_{\text{GUT}} \sim M_W$. Hence whatever solves the usual hierarchy problem may also address the existence of an intermediate scale.

It is also possible that the intermediate scale is of the same order as the weak scale. In such a scenario, the Yukawa interaction that gives rise to the 10_M mass would have to be different from the one that gives rise to the mass of ordinary fermions, in order to avoid the first- and second-generation 10_M particles being unacceptably light.

A Higgs field with an intermediate-scale vev could leave behind intermediate-scale particles that could disturb unification. In this scenario, however, it is the $SO(10)$ singlet component that acquires the vev, so it is reasonable to expect that the particles acquire masses approximately within full $SO(10)$ multiplets. Then they do not upset gauge unification, as discussed above.

A slight variation of this model is to use a second Higgs field in the adjoint representation instead of $351'_{H2}$. Since $78 \rightarrow 1_0 + 45_0 + 16_{-3} + \overline{16}_3$, a vev in the 1_0 direction breaks E_6 to $SO(10) \times U(1)$. Then, as above, a $351'_H$ vev in the $\overline{126}_{-2}$ direction and a 78_H vev in the adjoint direction complete the breaking to the SM, but with an extra unbroken $U(1)$. This extra $U(1)$ is broken at the intermediate scale where 10_M and S_M acquire mass; the mass of S_M is generated via the non-renormalizable operator $27_M 27_M \overline{H} \overline{H}$, where $H = 27_H, 351_H, 351'_H$, and is of order $M_I^2/M_P \sim 100$ GeV.

The results of E_6 also apply to the trinified group, $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \equiv G_{\text{TR}}$, where the equality of the three gauge couplings is enforced by a discrete symmetry, such as $\mathbb{Z}_3$ [13, 18]. It is a maximal subgroup of E_6 but is an interesting GUT candidate itself, in particular since it is broken to the SM without adjoint Higgs fields.

Leptons, quarks and antiquarks are in different representations,

$$(1, 3, \overline{3}) + (\overline{3}, 1, 3) + (3, \overline{3}, 1) \equiv L + Q^c + Q, \quad (7)$$

which together complete the 27 of E_6 . Thus Q_M contains the quark doublet plus a color triplet, B , whereas the corresponding color anti-triplet, B^c , and the SM antiquark singlets are in Q_M^c . The lepton and antilepton fields are held by L_M .

In the minimal model, G_{TR} is broken to the SM by a pair of Higgs fields, L_H , when the SM singlets, S_H and N_H , acquire GUT-scale vevs. These singlets are identical to the $SO(10)$ singlet field and the SM singlet field in the 16_1 -component of 27_H . The vev of N_H breaks R parity, and thus dimension-four baryon- and lepton-number violating operators are generated analogously to E_6 , as discussed above [see Eqs. (5) and (6)]. As in E_6 , this can be evaded by imposing matter parity, under which Q_M, Q_M^c

⁵It might be possible to use $351'_{H1}$ or $351'_{H2}$ for this purpose.

and L_M are odd. The vev of S_H generates the dimension-five baryon-number violating operators via the dimension-six operator $Q_M Q_M Q_M L_M \bar{L}_H$, and hence is suppressed by only $M_{\text{GUT}}/M_P \sim 10^{-2}$, again analogous to E_6 .

We can, however, break G_{TR} by a different pair of Higgs fields, $\Phi_a(1, \bar{6}, 6)$. This is the analogue of the E_6 model broken by two Higgs fields in the $351'_H$ representation. Under $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \equiv G_{3221}$, the $(1, 1, 1)_0$ component of Φ_1 acquires a vev, breaking G_{TR} to G_{3221} . In doing so, the singlet S_M acquires mass via the operator $L_M L_M \Phi_1$. Next, the $(1, 1, 3)_{-2}$ component of Φ_2 breaks G_{3221} to the SM and the singlet N_M acquires mass via the coupling $L_M L_M \Phi_2$. This breaks $U(1)_{B-L}$ by two units, and hence R parity is automatic. As in the E_6 scenario discussed above, the fields in 10_M remain massless. We must therefore introduce another Higgs field, L_H , that acquires an intermediate-scale vev in the S_H direction and generates a mass for 10_M as well as the dimension-five operators suppressed by M_I/M_P . Thus, as in E_6 , the Higgs field that gives mass to 10_M also generates the dimension-five operators.

The trinified model offers another possibility not available in $SO(10)$ and E_6 . We can remove the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ that equates the three gauge couplings, and assume that some additional structure, such as string theory, is responsible for their equality. Then we can introduce a discrete symmetry under which quark and lepton fields transform differently. As an example, consider a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, under which the quark fields are odd but the lepton fields even. Then baryon-number violating interactions are absent altogether at the classical level, via operators of any dimension. However, this discrete symmetry has mixed $\mathbb{Z}_2 - SU(3)_{L,R}$ anomalies, and may be strongly violated by quantum gravitational effects [19].

In this paper we have shown that gravitationally-induced baryon- and lepton-number violating dimension-five operators are generically suppressed by $M_{\text{GUT}}/M_P \sim 10^{-2}$ in both E_6 and $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$, which violates the bounds on proton decay. However, if we allow for an intermediate scale, we may arrange for these operators to be suppressed by $M_I/M_P \leq 10^{-7}$, and thus evade these bounds. The only models of this type that we found also automatically preserve R parity, and thus forbid dimension-four baryon- and lepton-number violating operators. A superpotential that yields the discussed scenario remains to be constructed.

We are grateful for conversations and correspondence with C. Albright, D. Berenstein, H. Dreiner, J. Harvey, H. M. Lee, J. Lykken, S. Martin, and Y. Shadmi. S. W. and S. W. thank the Aspen Center for Physics and the DESY Theory Group for hospitality. This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under contract No. DE-FG02-91ER40677.

References

- [1] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B **193**, 150 (1981).
- [2] S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 2769 (1992).
- [3] L. E. Ibanez and G. G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. B **368**, 3 (1992); H. K. Dreiner, C. Luhn and M. Thormeier, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 075007 (2006).
- [4] S. Wiesenfeldt, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **19**, 2155 (2004); P. Nath and P. F. Perez, hep-ph/0601023.
- [5] J. R. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. B **121**, 123 (1983); J. R. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. B **124**, 484 (1983).
- [6] J. D. Wells, hep-ph/0306127; Phys. Rev. D **71**, 015013 (2005).
- [7] see, e.g., A. Melfo and G. Senjanovic, hep-ph/0511011.
- [8] see, e.g., H. Murayama and D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. B **336**, 221 (1994); M. Kakizaki and M. Yamaguchi, JHEP **0206**, 032 (2002).
- [9] H. K. Dreiner and M. Thormeier, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 053002 (2004); R. Harnik, D. T. Larson, H. Murayama and M. Thormeier, Nucl. Phys. B **706**, 372 (2005).
- [10] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **91**, 3 (2000).
- [11] H. Georgi, in *Particles and fields* (ed. C. Carlson), AIP 1975; H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, Annals Phys. **93** (1975) 193.
- [12] F. Gursey, P. Ramond and P. Sikivie, Phys. Lett. B **60**, 177 (1976);
- [13] Y. Achiman and B. Stech, in *Advanced Summer Institute on New Phenomena in Lepton and Hadron Physics*, eds. D. E. C. Fries and J. Wess (Plenum, New York, 1979); S. L. Glashow, in *Fifth Workshop on Grand Unification*, eds. K. Kang, H. Fried, and P. Frampton (World Scientific, Singapore, 1984), p. 88.
- [14] C. S. Aulakh, A. Melfo, A. Rasin and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Lett. B **459**, 557 (1999).
- [15] C. H. Albright and S. M. Barr, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 093008 (2000).
- [16] Y. Achiman and B. Stech, Phys. Lett. B **77**, 389 (1978); R. Barbieri and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **91**, 369 (1980); M. Bando and T. Kugo, Prog. Theor. Phys. **101**, 1313 (1999); M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yoshioka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **104**, 211 (2000); N. Maekawa and T. Yamashita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **107**, 1201 (2002); B. Stech and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 035002 (2004).
- [17] C. F. Kolda and J. March-Russell, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 4252 (1997).
- [18] K. S. Babu, X. G. He and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. D **33**, 763 (1986); G. Lazarides, C. Panagiotakopoulos and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. B **315**, 325 (1993) [Erratum-ibid. B **317**, 661 (1993)]; G. Lazarides and C. Panagiotakopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **336**, 190 (1994); Phys. Rev. D **51**, 2486 (1995); G. R. Dvali and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. B **326**, 258 (1994); ibid. B **339**, 241 (1994); ibid. B **403**, 65 (1997); N. Maekawa and Q. Shafi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **109**, 279 (2003); S. Willenbrock, Phys. Lett. B **561**, 130 (2003); J. Sayre, S. Wiesenfeldt and S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 035013 (2006).
- [19] L. E. Ibanez and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 291 (1991); L. E. Ibanez, Nucl. Phys. B **398**, 301 (1993).